



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,865	08/14/2001	Eric Henderson	7211.01	8708

23510 7590 06/26/2003

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH, LLP
ONE SOUTH PINCKNEY STREET
P O BOX 1806
MADISON, WI 53701

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

FORMAN, BETTY J

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1634

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/929,865	HENDERSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BJ Forman	1634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-13 and 17-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Disposition of Claims

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 August 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6/02. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, Claims 1-13 and 17-20 in papers filed 31 December 2002 is acknowledged.

The traversal is on the grounds that it would not be undue burden to examine the claims of all groups I and II. However, it is maintained that undue burden would be required to examine the claims of groups II along with claims of group I as evidenced by the fact that the claims of groups I and II have acquired a separate status in the art as recognized by their different classifications as recognized by their divergent subject matter and because a search of the subject matter of invention I is not co-extensive with a search of invention II. For example, a search of the subject matter of Invention I would encompass a search of the apparatus art including X, Y, Z translation components, controls and movements. In contrast, a search of the subject matter of Invention II would encompass a search of depositing methods including deposition materials, material depositions and material placement on a substrate. As such, a search for the subject matter of Invention I would not be co-extensive with a search for the subject matter of Invention II.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Priority

2. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged. The Provisional Application filed 15 August 2000 upon which priority is claimed provides adequate support under 35 U.S.C. 112 for claims 1-13 and 17-20 of this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 7-10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and (e) as being anticipated by Little et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,024,925, issued 15 February 2000).

Regarding Claim 1, Little et al disclose an apparatus for creating a molecular array comprising: a base (i.e. stage, Fig 1, #26); a Z controller operably connected to the base wherein the Z controller is selectively positionable along a Z axis; a deposition probe (i.e. robotic arm with pin assembly Fig. 1, #24 and #38) removable and operably connected to the Z controller so that the deposition probe is selectively positionable along the Z axis by the Z controller; an X, Y controller operably connected to the base wherein the X, Y controller is selectively positionable along an X axis and a Y axis, the X, Y controller further comprising a deposition substrate operably attached thereto and wherein the movement of the X, Y controller moves the deposition substrate between a first position and a second position, the second position being operably positioned relative to the deposition probe; and an X, Y translation stage operably connected to the base wherein the X, Y translation stage is selectively positionable along an X axis and a Y axis, the X, Y translation stage further

Art Unit: 1634

comprising a loading substrate (i.e. source plate, Fig. 1, #20) operably attached thereto and wherein the movement of the X, Y translation stage moves the loading substrate between a first position and a second position, the second position being operably located relative to the deposition probe (Column 5, line 66-Column 6, line 67).

Regarding Claim 2, Little et al disclose the apparatus further comprising a control computer (i.e. data processor, Fig. 1, #12, Column 6, lines 1-28).

Regarding Claim 7, Little et al disclose the apparatus wherein the loading substrate comprises one or more deposition materials i.e. 384 wells with DNA samples (Column 9, lines 1-5).

Regarding Claim 8, Little et al disclose the apparatus further comprising an optical microscope operably attached to the base (i.e. optical encoders, Column 14, lines 37-48).

Regarding Claim 9, Little et al disclose the apparatus further comprising a force feedback monitor (i.e. feedback via motor-mounted rotary optical encoder, Column 14, lines 44-48).

Regarding Claim 10, Little et al disclose the apparatus wherein the deposition probe includes a tip (i.e. pin (Column 6, lines 1-13).

Regarding Claim 17, Little et al disclose an apparatus for creating a molecular array comprising: a Z controller; a deposition probe (i.e. robotic arm with pin assembly Fig. 1, #24 and #38) operably connected to the Z controller the deposition probe comprising a tip (i.e. pin (Column 6, lines 1-13); an X, Y controller operably attached to the Z controller and a deposition substrate operably affixed to the X, Y controller wherein the deposition substrate is selectively moveable between a first position and a second position and the X, Y controller moves the deposition substrate to the second position the deposition substrate operably positioned relative to the tip (Column 5, line 66-Column 6, line 67).

5. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cathcart et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,443,791, issued 22 August 1995).

Regarding Claim 1, Cathcart et al disclose an apparatus for creating a molecular array comprising: a base (i.e. work surface, Fig 1, #22) ; a Z controller operably connected to the base wherein the Z controller is selectively positionable along a Z axis; a deposition probe (i.e. pipette Fig. 1, 33) removable and operably connected to the Z controller so that the deposition probe is selectively positionable along the Z axis by the Z controller; an X, Y controller operably connected to the base wherein the X, Y controller is selectively positionable along an X axis and a Y axis, the X, Y controller further comprising a deposition substrate operably attached thereto and wherein the movement of the X, Y controller moves the deposition substrate between a first position and a second position, the second position being operably positioned relative to the deposition probe; and an X, Y translation stage operably connected to the base wherein the X, Y translation stage is selectively positionable along an X axis and a Y axis, the X, Y translation stage further comprising a loading substrate (i.e. reagent and/or enzyme stations, Fig. 1, #23, 27) operably attached thereto and wherein the movement of the X, Y translation stage moves the loading substrate between a first position and a second position, the second position being operably located relative to the deposition probe (Column 6, line 40-67 and Column 9, line 57-Column 14, line 7).

Regarding Claim 2, Cathcart et al disclose the apparatus further comprising a control computer (Column 9, lines 57-64).

Regarding Claim 7, Cathcart et al disclose the apparatus wherein the loading substrate comprises one or more deposition materials (i.e. reagent and/or enzyme stations, Fig. 1, #23, 27).

Regarding Claim 8, Cathcart et al disclose the apparatus further comprising an optical microscope operably attached to the base (i.e. optical sensors and/or optical detectors, Column 13, lines 62-66 and Column 28, lines 2-6).

Regarding Claim 10, Cathcart et al disclose the apparatus wherein the deposition probe includes a tip (i.e. pipette needle Column 8, lines 14-17).

Regarding Claim 17, Cathcart et al disclose an apparatus for creating a molecular array comprising: a Z controller; a deposition probe (i.e. pipette Fig. 1, #33) operably connected to the Z controller the deposition probe comprising a tip (i.e. pipette Column 8, lines 14-17); an X, Y controller operably attached to the Z controller and a deposition substrate operably affixed to the X, Y controller wherein the deposition substrate is selectively moveable between a first position and a second position and the X, Y controller moves the deposition substrate to the second position the deposition substrate operably positioned relative to the tip (Column 6, line 40-67 and Column 9, line 57-Column 14, line 7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3, 4, 11, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,024,925, issued 15 February 2000) in view of Regan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,395,554, filed 3 September 1999).

Regarding Claims 3-4 and 11, Little et al disclose an apparatus for creating a molecular array comprising: a base (i.e. stage, Fig 1, #26); a Z controller operably connected to the base wherein the Z controller is selectively positionable along a Z axis; a deposition probe (i.e. robotic arm with pin assembly Fig. 1, #24 and #38) removable and operably connected to the Z controller so that the deposition probe is selectively positionable along the Z axis by the Z controller; an X, Y controller operably connected to the base wherein the X, Y controller is selectively positionable along an X axis and a Y axis, the X, Y controller further comprising a deposition substrate operably attached thereto and wherein the movement of the X, Y controller moves the deposition substrate between a first position and a second position, the second position being operably positioned relative to the deposition probe; and an X, Y translation stage operably connected to the base wherein the X, Y translation stage is selectively positionable along an X axis and a Y axis, the X, Y translation stage further comprising a loading substrate (i.e. source plate, Fig. 1, #20) operably attached thereto and wherein the movement of the X, Y translation stage moves the loading substrate between a first position and a second position, the second position being operably located relative to the deposition probe (Column 5, line 66-Column 6, line 67) wherein all functions of the apparatus are operably connected to the control computer (Column 6, lines 1-28). Little et al do not teach the apparatus comprising a humidity controller to control humidity around the deposition probe. However, humidity control was known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Regan et al who teach that it is important to control humidity during array deposit to thereby prevent evaporation (Column 1, lines 52-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the apparatus of Little et al by incorporating a humidity controller to thereby prevent

evaporation of the deposited material prior to or during deposition for the expected benefit of accurate deposit as taught by Regan et al (Column 1, lines 52-65).

Regarding Claim 18, Little et al disclose an apparatus for creating a molecular array comprising: a base (i.e. stage, Fig 1, #26) ; a Z controller operably connected to the base wherein the Z controller is selectively positionable along a Z axis; a deposition probe (i.e. robotic arm with pin assembly Fig. 1, #24 and #38) removable and operably connected to the Z controller so that the deposition probe is selectively positionable along the Z axis by the Z controller; an X, Y controller operably connected to the base wherein the X, Y controller is selectively positionable along an X axis and a Y axis, the X, Y controller further comprising a deposition substrate operably attached thereto and wherein the movement of the X, Y controller moves the deposition substrate between a first position and a second position, the second position being operably positioned relative to the deposition probe; and an X, Y translation stage operably connected to the base wherein the X, Y translation stage is selectively positionable along an X axis and a Y axis, the X, Y translation stage further comprising a loading substrate (i.e. source plate, Fig. 1, #20) operably attached thereto and wherein the movement of the X, Y translation stage moves the loading substrate between a first position and a second position, the second position being operably located relative to the deposition probe (Column 5, line 66-Column 6, line 67). Little et al do not teach the apparatus comprising a humidity controller to control humidity around the deposition probe. However, humidity control was known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Regan et al who teach that it is important to control humidity during array deposit to thereby prevent evaporation (Column 1, lines 52-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the apparatus of Little et al by incorporating a humidity controller to thereby prevent evaporation of the deposited material prior to or during deposition for the expected benefit of accurate deposit as taught by Regan et al (Column 1, lines 52-65).

Regarding Claim 20, Little et al teach an apparatus comprising and X, Y, and Z controller; a loading substrate operably and movably attached to the Z controller i.e. the Z controller positions the pin assembly over the loading substrate (i.e. source plate) whereby the loading substrate is operably and movable attached to the Z controller (Column 6, lines 1-13). The apparatus further comprising a deposition substrate operably and movably attached to the Z controller i.e. the Z controller positions the pin assembly over the deposition substrate (i.e. substrate, Fig. 1 #34) whereby the substrate is operably and movable attached to the Z controller (Column 6, lines 1-13). The apparatus further comprising a deposition probe operably attached to the Z controller i.e. the Z controller moves the pin assembly (Column 6, lines 1-13). Little et al do not teach the apparatus comprising a humidity controller to control humidity around the deposition probe. However, humidity control was known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Regan et al who teach that it is important to control humidity during array deposit to thereby prevent evaporation (Column 1, lines 52-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the apparatus of Little et al by incorporating a humidity controller to thereby prevent evaporation of the deposited material prior to or during deposition for the expected benefit of accurate deposit as taught by Regan et al (Column 1, lines 52-65).

8. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,024,925, issued 15 February 2000) in view of Tonucci et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,087,274, filed 3 March 1998).

Regarding Claims 5 and 6, Little et al disclose an apparatus for creating a molecular array comprising: a base (i.e. stage, Fig 1, #26) ; a Z controller operably connected to the base wherein the Z controller is selectively positionable along a Z axis; a deposition probe (i.e. robotic arm with pin assembly Fig. 1, #24 and #38) removable and operably connected to the Z controller so that the deposition probe is selectively positionable along the Z axis by the Z controller; an X, Y controller operably connected to the base wherein the X, Y controller is selectively positionable along an X axis and a Y axis, the X, Y controller further comprising a deposition substrate operably attached thereto and wherein the movement of the X, Y controller moves the deposition substrate between a first position and a second position, the second position being operably positioned relative to the deposition probe; and an X, Y translation stage operably connected to the base wherein the X, Y translation stage is selectively positionable along an X axis and a Y axis, the X, Y translation stage further comprising a loading substrate (i.e. source plate, Fig. 1, #20) operably attached thereto and wherein the movement of the X, Y translation stage moves the loading substrate between a first position and a second position, the second position being operably located relative to the deposition probe (Column 5, line 66-Column 6, line 67) wherein the Z axis spans 50m m and the X and Y axis span 250 and 400m m (Column 14, lines 37-48) but they are silent regarding the spatial resolution along the X, Y and Z axis. However, spatial resolution of 200nm along a Z axis and 20 nm along an X and Y axis were well known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Tonucci et al who teach an apparatus comprising X, Y and Z controllers wherein the Z axis has a spatial resolution of approximately 200nm and the X and Y axis has a spatial resolution of approximately 20 nm (Column 6, lines 46-64). Furthermore they Tonucci et al teach that the spatial resolution of their apparatus produces exceptional devices having minimum feature sizes (Column 6, lines 46-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the spatial resolution of Tonucci et al to the X, Y and Z controllers of Little et al to thereby produce

exceptional devices having minimum feature sizes as taught by Tonucci et al (Column 6, lines 46-49).

9. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,024,925, issued 15 February 2000) in view of Anderson et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,993,627, issued 30 November 1999).

Regarding Claim 12, Little et al disclose an apparatus for creating a molecular array comprising: a base (i.e. stage, Fig 1, #26); a Z controller operably connected to the base wherein the Z controller is selectively positionable along a Z axis; a deposition probe (i.e. robotic arm with pin assembly Fig. 1, #24 and #38) removable and operably connected to the Z controller so that the deposition probe is selectively positionable along the Z axis by the Z controller; an X, Y controller operably connected to the base wherein the X, Y controller is selectively positionable along an X axis and a Y axis, the X, Y controller further comprising a deposition substrate operably attached thereto and wherein the movement of the X, Y controller moves the deposition substrate between a first position and a second position, the second position being operably positioned relative to the deposition probe; and an X, Y translation stage operably connected to the base wherein the X, Y translation stage is selectively positionable along an X axis and a Y axis, the X, Y translation stage further comprising a loading substrate (i.e. source plate, Fig. 1, #20) operably attached thereto and wherein the movement of the X, Y translation stage moves the loading substrate between a first position and a second position, the second position being operably located relative to the deposition probe (Column 5, line 66-Column 6, line 67) wherein their X, Y, Z controller is computer driven motion control (Column 14, lines 37-60) but they do not teach the computer control is via a stepper motor control card. However, it was well known in the art at the time

the claimed invention was made that stepper motor control cards facilitate deposition of various materials having different weights and compositions as taught by Anderson et al (Column 11, lines 64-Column 12, lines 18). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to apply the stepper motor control card of Anderson et al to the computer controlled deposition of Little et al to thereby facilitate deposition of various materials as taught by Anderson et al (Column 11, lines 64-Column 12, lines 18).

10. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,024,925, issued 15 February 2000) in view Anderson et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,993,627, issued 30 November 1999) as applied to Claim 12 above and further in view of Regan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,395,554, filed 3 September 1999) and Morozov et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,350,609, filed 8 May 2000).

Regarding Claim 13, Little and Anderson et al teach the apparatus of Claim 12 as discussed directly above. However, they do not teach the apparatus comprising a humidity controller to control humidity around the deposition probe. However, humidity control was known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Regan et al who teach that it is important to control humidity during array deposit to thereby prevent evaporation (Column 1, lines 52-65). Furthermore, Morozov et al teach that humidity is controller comprises a dry gas source humidity source i.e. chamber and gas flow monitor (Column 23, lines 29-37 and Column 31, line 54-Column 32, line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the apparatus of Little et al by incorporating a humidity controller to thereby prevent

evaporation of the deposited material prior to or during deposition for the expected benefit of accurate deposit as taught by Regan et al (Column 1, lines 52-65).

11. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,024,925, issued 15 February 2000) in view of Regan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,395,554, filed 3 September 1999) as applied to Claim 20 above and further in view of Mirkin et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0063212, filed 7 January 1999).

Regarding Claim 20, Little et al teach an apparatus comprising and X, Y, and Z controller; a loading substrate operably and movably attached to the Z controller i.e. the Z controller positions the pin assembly over the loading substrate (i.e. source plate) whereby the loading substrate is operably and movable attached to the Z controller (Column 6, lines 1-13). The apparatus further comprising a deposition substrate operably and movably attached to the Z controller i.e. the Z controller positions the pin assembly over the deposition substrate (i.e. substrate, Fig. 1 #34) whereby the substrate is operably and movable attached to the Z controller (Column 6, lines 1-13). The apparatus further comprising a deposition probe operably attached to the Z controller i.e. the Z controller moves the pin assembly (Column 6, lines 1-13). Little et al do not teach the apparatus comprising a humidity controller to control humidity around the deposition probe. However, humidity control was known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made as taught by Regan et al who teach that it is important to control humidity during array deposit to thereby prevent evaporation (Column 1, lines 52-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the apparatus of Little et al by incorporating a humidity controller to

thereby prevent evaporation of the deposited material prior to or during deposition for the expected benefit of accurate deposit as taught by Regan et al (Column 1, lines 52-65).

Little et al do not teach the apparatus further comprises an ozone source. However, it was well known in the art at the time the claimed invention was made that cleaning deposition probe tips with ozone increases the hydrophobicity of the probe tip as taught by Mirkin et al (¶ 54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to modify the apparatus of Little et al by adding an ozone source for cleaning and increasing the hydrophobicity of the probe tip for the expected benefit of facilitating deposition of aqueous materials as taught by Mirkin et al (¶ 54).

Double Patenting

12. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

13. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/128,727. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1634

14. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

15. Claims 2-13 and 17-20 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 21-33 and 36 of copending Application No. 10/128,727. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are drawn to an apparatus comprising deposition probes and operably connected X, Y, Z controllers for moving the deposition probes. The claim sets differ only in the arrangement of the claim limitations within the claims. For example, line 3 of instant claim 1 recites "a Z controller operably connected to the base..." and line 7 recites "an X, Y controller operably connected to the base...". In slight contrast, line 10 of Claim 21 in the '727 application recites "an X, Y, Z controller operably connected to the base...". As such, the claims are drawn to non-patentably distinct apparatus.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1634

Conclusion

16. No claim is allowed.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BJ Forman whose telephone number is (703) 306-5878. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 TO 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on (703) 308-1119. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4242 for regular communications and (703) 308-8724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

W
BJ Forman, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 1634
June 19, 2003